

REMARKS

2 Page 1 of the specification is amended to add the serial numbers of the
3 related applications.

4 Claim 1 is amended in response to an indefiniteness rejection and
5 claims 10-16 are amended to improve clarity. Claim 17 is amended to add the
6 feature "wherein a level of trust associated with the indications depends upon a
7 first condition of the one or more first conditions", which is supported by at least
8 claim 1 as originally filed. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-21
9 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of
10 all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**Claim 1**

13 Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being
14 indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. In response, claim 1 is amended to recite
15 antecedent basis.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**Claims 1-17 and 19-21**

18 Claims 1-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
19 unpatentable over the reference "Decentralized Trust Management" (hereinafter
20 "Blaze" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,467 (hereinafter Gong). Applicants
21 respectfully traverse.

22 Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

23 receiving at least a second condition and a
24 second element of evidence, wherein the second
25 condition is associated with the permission set and a
level of trust associated with the second element is
dependent upon the first condition. (emphasis added)

1 The Office Action asserts that the "first condition" and the "first evidence"
2 recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A's verifiable
3 digital signature on B's key is the condition, and A's public/private key pair is
4 evidence".

5 The Office Action also asserts that the "second condition" and the "second
6 evidence" recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A to
7 verify trustworthiness of B's key is condition, and digital signature of A is
8 evidence."

9 Applicants respectfully traverse. The level of trust associated with the
10 digital signature of A (what the Office Action terms the "second evidence") does
11 not depend on A's verifiable digital signature on B's key (what the Office Action
12 terms the "first condition"). Rather, Blaze explicitly discloses on page 2, second
13 column, lines 5-9:

14 a user may specify the *degree of trust* that he has in
15 each introducer; an individual may be designated
unknown, untrusted, marginally trusted, or completely
16 *trusted*. Each user stores his trust information ..."
(emphasis original).

17 Thus, Blaze discloses that the level of trust is determined by the user, which
18 is not dependent upon what the Office Action terms as the "first condition". Gong
19 is cited as disclosing a means for secure class resolution, loading and definition.

20 Therefore, the cited combination of Blaze and Gong does not teach or
21 suggest the feature, "a level of trust associated with the second element is
22 dependent upon the first condition", as recited in claim 1. Because the cited
23 combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the cited
24 combination fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1.
25

1 Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 are patentable over the cited
2 references.

3 Claim 11 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
4 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
5 that claim 11 and dependent claim 12 are patentable over the cited references for at
6 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

7 Claim 13 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
8 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
9 that claim 13 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that
10 claim 1 is patentable.

11 Claim 14 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
12 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
13 that claim 14 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that
14 claim 1 is patentable.

15 Claim 15 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second
16 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert
17 that claim 15 and dependent claim 16 are patentable over the cited references for at
18 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

19 Claim 17 as amended recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a
20 second element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants
21 respectfully assert that claim 17 and dependent claims 19-21 are patentable over the
22 cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

23 Claim 18

24

25

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Blaze in view of Gong and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,678 (hereinafter Itoh). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 18 depends from amended claim 17. As discussed above, Blaze and Gong do not render amended claim 17 obvious. Itoh is cited as disclosing a problem solving apparatus using state transition. However, Applicants respectfully assert that this disclosure does not overcome the deficiencies of Blaze and Gong in the rejection of claim 17. Consequently, the cited combination of Blaze, Gong and Itoh do not teach each and every element of claim 17 and, thus, fails to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, claim 17 is also patentable over the combination of Blaze, Gong and Itoh. As claim 18 depends from claim 17, claim 18 is patentable over Blaze, Gong and Itoh for at least the reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe all pending claims are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____

By: Lawrence E. Lycke
Reg. No. 38,540
(206) 315-4001 x103